

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-11, 15-18, 20 and 21-28 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 15-18 and 20 are amended. Claims 21-28 are added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Vu in the April 7, 2005 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the personal interview, as well as a subsequent interview conducted by telephone later the same day, are incorporated into the following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments merely incorporate subject matter from a former dependent claim); (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the advisory action. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-5, 15 and 17 recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a project." Claims 8, 16 and 18 recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined element in the subject name represents a project." Claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements includes an organizational unit name allocated for representing a project name and a common name allocated for representing a purpose of operation of the project." Support for these claims may be found throughout the specification. For example, specific support may be found at Fig. 6; Fig. 7; original claims 3

and 7; and page 8, lines 2-8; and page 11, lines 6-21 of the original specification (paragraphs [0034] and [0052]-[0053] of U.S. Publication 2002/0059437 A1).

One example of a "project" is given at page 8, lines 2-8 or paragraph [0034] of U.S. Publication 2002/0059437 A1, which states:

[0034] The **project means businesses or an activities managed together**, and for convenience sake, it refers to business conducted between the managing company and other cooperating companies. The cooperating company is registered in relation to the **project**. A **project** conducted by the managing company alone or a non-business activity may also be handled as the "**project**". **This makes it possible to issue a certificate independent of the organizational structure.** (emphasis added)

However, "project" is used in the claims not only in this definition but also under its ordinary and customary meanings, e.g., as defined in dictionaries. Another definition, supported at page 5, lines 23-25 (paragraph [0028] of U.S. Publication 2002/0059437 A1, is "something achieved in cooperation between a managing entity and cooperating entities."

I. §103 Rejection

Claims 1-2, 4, 8-11, 15-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,088,805 to Davis et al. ("Davis") in view of U.S. Patent 5,922,074 to Richard et al. ("Richard"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 4-5, 15 and 17 recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a project." Claims 8, 16 and 18 recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined element in the subject name represents a project." Claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements includes an organizational unit name allocated for representing a project name and a common name allocated for representing a purpose of operation of the project." Support for these claims may be found throughout the specification. For example, specific support may be found at Fig. 6; Fig. 7; original claims 3 and 7; and paragraphs [0034] and [0052]-[0053].

Applicants respectfully submit that the Davis/Richard combination does not disclose, teach or suggest the project feature, nor would it have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include such elements within a certificate for use in determining access rights, as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, 8, 15-18 and 20 are patentably distinguishable over the Davis/Richard combination. Claims 2, 6 and 9-11 depend from independent claims 1, 5 and 8, respectfully, and are likewise patentably distinguishable over the Davis/Richard combination for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. §103 Rejection of claims 5-6

The Office Action rejects claims 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Davis in view of Richard and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,884,312 to Dustan et al. ("Dustan"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a project." Support for these claims may be found throughout the specification. For example, specific support may be found at Fig. 6; Fig. 7; original claims 3 and 7; and paragraphs [0034] and [0052]-[0053].

Claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over Davis/Richard/Dustan, at least for its recitation of "project." Claim 6 depends from independent claim 5 and is likewise patentably distinguishable over the Davis/Richard/Dustan combination for at least its dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features it recites. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. New Claims

Claims 21-28 have been added. Claims 21-28 recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements further include an element allocated for representing a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate." Support for these claims may be found throughout the specification. For example, specific support may be found at Fig. 6; Fig. 7; original claims 3 and 7; and page 8, lines 2-8; and page 11, lines 6-21 of the original specification (paragraphs [0034] and [0052]-[0053] of U.S. Publication 2002/0059437 A1).


Claims 21-28 depend from independent claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 15, 16, 17, and 18, respectively, and are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-11, 15-18, 20 and 21-28 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff

Registration No. 41,218

JAO:JMH/hs

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 10, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--